## Case 1:15-cr-00643-PKC Document 390 Filed 03/15/17 Page 1 of 53

**H2FVGALS** 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 15 CR 643 (PKC) V. 5 JASON GALANIS, 6 Defendant. SENTENCE -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. February 15, 2017 9 11:30 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. P. KEVIN CASTEL, 12 District Judge 13 APPEARANCES 14 15 PREET BHARARA, 16 United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 17 BRIAN BLAIS REBECCA MERMELSTEIN 18 AIMEE HECTOR Assistant United States Attorneys 19 THOMAS P. MAZZUCCO 20 AARON K. McCLELLAN Attorneys for Defendant 21 22 ALSO PRESENT: SHANNON BIENIEK, FBI 23 24 25

1 (Case called)

MR. BLAIS: Good morning, your Honor.

Brian Blais, Amy Hector, and Rebecca Mermelstein for the government. Also with us at counsel table is Special Agent Shannon Bieniek from the FBI.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Good to see you.

For the defendant?

MR. MAZZUCCO: Good afternoon, your Honor.

Thomas Mazzucco and Aaron McClellan here with the defendant, Jason Galanis.

THE COURT: Good to see you all.

Now, Mr. Mazzucco, the first thing I'm going to do is I'm going to go through the materials I have. The question will be do I have everything I should have.

So I have a presentence report, recommendation, and addendum that were transmitted to me by probation on January 30, 2017, which is also the date that the report was revised. I have redacted and unredacted sentencing memoranda from the government which was submitted on February 8, 2017. I also have a redacted and unredacted sentencing — well, I have a sentencing memorandum filed February 1, 2017, and then I have an ex parte under seal submission dated February 1, 2017, which includes a letter written by Mr. Galanis.

Now, have you filed an unredacted version of these materials, sir?

1 MR. MAZZUCCO: We have not, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. I'm going to direct you to do 2 3 that by Tuesday of next week. 4 MR. MAZZUCCO: We will, your Honor. THE COURT: There's a letter from the defendant which 5 6 is 11 pages in length, as well as a letter from his wife, Monet 7 Berger, and others. Do I have everything I should have on the subject of 8 9 sentencing? 10 MR. MAZZUCCO: On behalf of the defendant, yes, you 11 do, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: All right. 13 Has the defendant read, reviewed, and discussed with 14 you the presentence report, recommendation, and addendum? 15 MR. MAZZUCCO: He has, your Honor. THE COURT: Does the defendant have any objections to 16 17 the facts set forth in the presentence report? MR. MAZZUCCO: Other than the objections we set forth 18 in our memorandum, and we have one issue I'd like to raise with 19 20 the Court about the starting point with reference to the change 21 of the guidelines with reference to his most recent plea 22 elevating his criminal history, that's one issue I'd like to 23 address with the Court.

talking about the facts, not the guideline calculation. I will

THE COURT: We're going to discuss that. First I'm

24

25

ask you about the guideline calculation. 1 2 Do you have any objections to the facts set forth in 3 the presentence report? 4 MR. MAZZUCCO: We do not, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: All right. Does the government have any objections to the facts 6 7 set forth in the presentence report? MR. BLAIS: We do not. 8 9 But just back to the Court's original question about 10 whether there are other materials in connection with sentence, 11 I think there are actually two additional things beyond the 12 list that your Honor provided. 13 There was, I think, one additional filing by the 14 defense on February 9th. It was a very short letter attaching 15 another letter in support of the defendant. THE COURT: I have it right here. 16 17 MR. BLAIS: It's dated February 9th. 18 THE COURT: Yes. And the letter relates to operation 19 gratitude. Is that what you're referring to? 20 MR. BLAIS: That is what I'm referring to. 21 THE COURT: I've seen it. Thank you for pointing that

MR. BLAIS: And then there was one additional filing by the government. We filed a one-page letter yesterday evening on the issue of restitution, which essentially said --

22

23

24

25

out.

1 THE COURT: You're going to need time.

MR. BLAIS: -- we're going to need time; and that we would request the Court set a briefing schedule on the issue of restitution.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BLAIS: So there was that one additional filing by the government.

THE COURT: Thank you for pointing that out.

All right. In the absence of any objection to the facts set forth in the presentence report -- am I understanding you correctly, Mr. Mazzucco, there are no objections to the facts?

MR. MAZZUCCO: There are no objections, your Honor.

Mr. Galanis has fully accepted responsibility for the facts.

They are annunciated in the plea agreement and in the presentence report.

THE COURT: All right.

I adopt as my findings of fact the facts set forth in the presentence report.

Now, let me hear you with regard to the guideline calculation. You pointed out that you had an objection with regard to the inclusion in the criminal history of the defendant the guilty plea before Judge Abrams, I take it because he has not been sentenced on that case.

MR. MAZZUCCO: That is correct, your Honor.

A few additional facts I'd like to share with reference to that.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. MAZZUCCO: So, your Honor, as the Court is well aware, we entered into a plea agreement with a guideline range of 121 to 151 months. We entered into that disposition back in July of last year.

Now, sentencing moves forward. The government is now asking for a guideline range, a starting point of 135 to 168 months.

THE COURT: Let's back up on that.

That's the guideline range that probation has determined in this case. The government is asking for a guideline sentence, as I understand it.

MR. MAZZUCCO: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I don't understand the government to have changed its position with regard to the plea agreement in this case.

MR. MAZZUCCO: No, they have not changed their mind to the plea agreement. But the starting point with the guidelines — a little bit of chronology. When we entered into this agreement, sentencing was set for December. Mr. Galanis has pled to the new case with his other counsel, Ms. Scolari and Mr. Madiou, who are present, in January. That plea elevated his Criminal History Category. And it's clear as day

in the guidelines that that can be done. But my concern is --1 2 THE COURT: Help me with that. Help me with that, 3 because I look at 4A1.1, sentence C, and it refers to one point 4 for each prior sentence not counted in A or B, up to a total of 5 four points. How do you get to a sentence which has not been 6 imposed? 7 4A1.2(a)(1) says: "The term 'prior sentence' means any sentence previously imposed upon adjudication of guilt, 8 9 whether by quilty plea, trial, or plea of nolo contendere, for 10 conduct not part of the instant offense." 11 Unless I've missed something, your client hasn't been 12 sentenced. 13 MR. MAZZUCCO: That is correct, your Honor. Exactly 14 what we were going to put forth to the Court; he has not been 15 sentenced. THE COURT: I thought I just understood you to say 16 17 that that's proper to include --MR. MAZZUCCO: Well, if he was sentenced on that 18 19 matter, that's why I want to give the Court a chronology. 20 I don't think that's necessary at this point. The matter is he 21

had not been sentenced on that matter. It would be unfair to use that to elevate his criminal history at this point.

THE COURT: It's not a question of whether it's fair or not; it doesn't look like it's permissible.

22

23

24

25

MR. MAZZUCCO: And I agree with you, your Honor. It's

1 not permissible. 2 THE COURT: Let me hear from the government. 3 Do you agree? 4 MR. BLAIS: I disagree, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Walk me through it. 6 MR. BLAIS: It is specifically provided for in the 7 guidelines under this particular circumstance. Again, we're focusing on the issue of what the guidelines require, not 8 9 whether this overstates his criminal history or some other 10 factor like that. 11 THE COURT: I understand. 12 MR. BLAIS: And I'm focusing specifically on 13 4A1.24(a)(4) of the guidelines. 14 THE COURT: One second. 15 MR. BLAIS: I'll give your Honor a moment to get 16 there. 17 That provision specifically says: "Where a defendant has been convicted of an offense -- " which is true here; he's 18 pled guilty -- "but not yet sentenced -- " which is, again, 19 20 true here; he has not yet been sentenced -- "such conviction 21 shall be counted as if it constituted a prior sentence under 22 4A1.1C," which provides for there being one criminal history 23 point, "if a sentence resulting from that conviction otherwise 24 would be counted."

So we think that provision covers exactly the

25

circumstance that we're in here, where there has been a guilty plea entered, but a sentence not yet imposed.

THE COURT: Yes, but help me out here. An application note can explain or clarify the meaning of a guideline provision.

MR. BLAIS: That's correct.

THE COURT: Can an application note modify the express language of a guideline?

MR. BLAIS: Are you referring to a specific application? Because 4A1.2(a)(4) is not an application note, it is a specific --

THE COURT: All right. So I may not have caught up with you. I have it. I have it.

All right. You're right. It's part of the guideline.

MR. BLAIS: It is a specific guideline; it is not an application note that we're referring to. I think this is the provision that was cited to by probation in the presentence report. And again, we do think it applies.

THE COURT: All right. What's your response?

MR. MAZZUCCO: Your Honor, we've looked through what the government submitted, and we disagree. And, again, the other argument, in case the Court is leaning in the other direction, is the whole chronology of the events, that this was unilaterally created by the government giving drop-dead dates, waiting with certain cases that caused the elevation.

THE COURT: Listen. There's a difference between arguing, if you will, that the guidelines overstate something or that the Court should depart from the guidelines or give a sentence outside the advisory guidelines.

I raised with you and we had a discussion of whether or not the inclusion of the conviction in the criminal history was permitted — indeed required — by the guidelines. And you said it was not. My preliminary reading focusing, I confess, on 4A1.2(a)(1), was that you were right. It has now been called to my attention that 4A1.2(a)(4) says otherwise.

Now, I'm inviting you to tell me why I'm not reading 4A1.2(a)(4) correctly, when it says "Where a defendant has been convicted of an offense, but not yet sentenced, such conviction shall be counted as if it constituted a prior sentence under 4A1.1(c), if a sentence resulting from that conviction otherwise would be counted."

Now, what's your argument?

MR. MAZZUCCO: Your Honor, the plain reading of the statute, I would have to be in agreement with the government.

I'm here to be candid with the Court. That's why I would like to make the chronological argument about the unfairness of the government unilaterally running up the base guideline calculation. I think that's what we need and we are prepared to argue today, because we do look at that note.

After what Mr. Blais said, I can see where there's an

applicability. But the reality is --

THE COURT: It sounds to me like your argument is that I should depart or vary from the guideline, not that the guideline is not properly stated on its face.

MR. MAZZUCCO: Yes, your Honor, that's exactly what I'm arguing.

THE COURT: Okay. That's a whole different situation.

Go ahead. And so, again, as we move into it, we'll talk about the guidelines a little more, if I may, your Honor.

Defense counsel was given this drop-dead date to plead, and that elevated the guidelines. The problem is the government unilaterally created this, and it put Mr. Galanis in a spot where he had no choice.

For example, when he pled to this case in July, there was an offer from the government to plead to both cases: This matter and the matter before Judge Abrams, before this Court.

And he was given a guideline range in that matter to plead to both cases of, I'll take a look at my notes here, that was 168 to 210 months.

We could not enter into a disposition into that matter because, one, Mr. Galanis at the time was pro se; we were not appointed to represent him, nor were we retained; I had not seen a single lick of discovery. I had just read a complaint and an indictment. I did forward some information —

Mr. Galanis asked me to forward early on to Mr. Blais and the

prosecution team some documents as to why he shouldn't be indicted in the case. But I was not professionally prepared — nor could I have been — to enter into that joint disposition. So we chose this disposition with the guideline range of 121 to 151 months.

Ironically, there's also shifting of the guidelines with reference to we had a sentencing date in December. And that was continued so that the government can continue to look at this issue of restitution. Again, Mr. Galanis is willing to make the restitution, if this Court orders; Mr. Galanis is accepting, as you will hear later, when he has an opportunity to speak to the Court, full responsibility for his actions.

There is no dispute about the facts. But if he had been sentenced in December, we wouldn't be here. So it's more of a chronological fundamental fairness as we move our way down on that front.

So those are my concerns.

I noticed that in the government's pleadings they advised the Court that the guideline range that Mr. Galanis pled to in Judge Abrams' court is 188 to 235 months. So they put that out there for the Court to see.

My concern is that we should stop and focus on the deal that we have here.

Now, when I contacted Mr. Blais about the change after I spoke to Mr. Kapitansky, the probation officer, he told me

that, We'll honor the deal. Then he comes back to me and said, Unfortunately, others in the office had made the decision not to honor that initial deal. So that's a fact that he could bring to the Court. I don't point towards the prosecution team, but it sounds like it was an office-wide decision.

So that's my argument on that fact.

The second prong that I'd like to talk about, if I may, at this point, is why the Court -- other reasons this Court should vary into a sentence, and then lastly --

THE COURT: I'm going to give you a full opportunity to do that. I'm not up to that yet.

MR. MAZZUCCO: Okay.

THE COURT: I'm going to invite your client to speak.

I'm going to give you an opportunity to speak.

First I have to determine what the correct guideline range is in this case. After I do that, I'll give you an opportunity to speak.

MR. MAZZUCCO: Thank you, your Honor. It's submitted.

THE COURT: Anything further from either side on the guideline calculation?

MR. BLAIS: No, your Honor. We believe the 135 to 168 that's reflected in our submission is the appropriate calculation of the guidelines.

THE COURT: How does the guideline range in your submission vary from the guidelines recommended by probation?

For example, probation has a sophisticated means increase. Is that included in your calculation?

MR. BLAIS: Your Honor, the 135 to 168 that's included in our submission — and that's derived largely from our plea agreement, with the exception of the additional criminal history point that we've just been discussing — that calculation differs from probation's calculations in two ways:

One is that probation has assessed a two-level enhancement for the use of sophisticated means.

THE COURT: And the other is because the offense was committed while on pretrial release in the Central District of California matter?

MR. BLAIS: Correct.

There's a three-level enhancement under, I believe, 3C1.2.

THE COURT: This is the question I'm asking you and you're required to respond: Are you urging that the office of probation has erroneously included those two enhancements?

MR. BLAIS: Yes, we are, your Honor. We believe those enhancements do not apply.

THE COURT: Why does the statutory enhancement not apply? As I see this, the defendant was arrested on the Central District of California case on or about May 24th, 2010, and the conspiracy continued, including the recruiting of Tagliaferri, through to September of 2010. Why wouldn't that

mean that a part of the conspiracy continued while he was on pretrial release?

MR. BLAIS: Your Honor, I don't dispute the factual recitation that you just gave. We actually quibble with the application of 3C1.3 here from a legal standpoint.

THE COURT: All right. Let me hear you.

MR. BLAIS: 3C1.3 provides: If a statutory sentencing enhancement, under 18, United States Code, Section 3147, applies, increase the offense level by three levels.

We obviously did not charge Mr. Galanis with a violation of Section 3147. I think it's uncertain from the case law whether this particular guidelines enhancement can apply in the absence of an actual charge under 3147. In fact, if the Court were to review the application note for this particular enhancement, what it requires is that the Court allocate the sentence, if you will —

THE COURT: I know.

MR. BLAIS: -- attribute it partially to the underlying conduct and partially to a sentence for the 3147 violation.

THE COURT: I've read the history going back to the Stevens case on forward. It seemed to me that the Second Circuit was backing away from some of its earlier juris prudence based on amendments to the commentary.

MR. BLAIS: Right. So given the structure of the

commentary for 3C1.3, which suggests that this allocation, which, again, suggests that there needs to be a charge under 3147 in order for 3C1.3 to actually apply, here, because there was no such charge, it is our position that it was legally not appropriate under these facts for that enhancement to apply. So we don't dispute the facts that your Honor recited, but we do dispute the legal applicability of 3C1.3 in a circumstance where 3147 hasn't been specifically charged.

THE COURT: But the grand jury need not charge 3147 for it to apply, I thought.

MR. BLAIS: I think that is accurate. I think it has to be specified somewhere for notice purposes, again, which has not happened here.

THE COURT: All right. Okay.

It seems to me that that's fundamental to due process, that you have to have notice that 3147 is at issue. And on that basis, I will not include that enhancement.

Now, talk to me about sophisticated means, because it sure looked to me like sophisticated means.

MR. BLAIS: Your Honor, sophisticated means, I think, is ultimately, in some respects, a bit of a judgment call.

There is guidance in the guidelines about the applicability to talk, for example, about locating in a telecommunications fraud, a phone banking fraud, essentially, if you locate the phone banks offshore, that that may qualify. That doesn't

provide, I think, a whole lot of guidance as to the applicability.

I think at the end of the day, our view was that at the end of the day this was a relatively straightforward fraud. There was an issuance of shares to somebody who didn't deserve them, who was not entitled to them, and then those shares were sold for the benefit of Mr. Galanis and his defendants. So it was ultimately a judgment call and it was, in our view, the best reading of the guidelines, was that that particular enhancement did not apply here.

THE COURT: All right.

Let me hear from defense counsel.

MR. MAZZUCCO: Your Honor, I would agree with the arguments the government has made with reference to both.

Would you like me to move forward into some additional arguments about comparative sentences and the others that --

THE COURT: No. We're talking about whether the sophisticated means enhancement applies. That's what we're talking about.

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ MAZZUCCO}\colon$$  It does not. I agree with the argument made by the government.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, counsel.

I think it's a very close question whether the sophisticated means enhancement applies. This case did not go to trial and I'm going to defer to the government's judgment on

this.

I will delete the enhancement under 3147 and the sophisticated means enhancement, which results in a total offense level of 31.

Let me hear with regard to the Criminal History Category. Is there any dispute that the defendant is in Criminal History Category III?

MR. BLAIS: Not from the government.

THE COURT: From the defendant?

MR. MAZZUCCO: Your Honor, again, reiterating the argument we made earlier about how he got to Criminal History Category III, we dispute that; we think he should be in Criminal History Category II, because the raise was generated, if the Court accepts their argument, by the fact that there was a plea that happened. Mr. Galanis's plea happened before Mr. --

THE COURT: Well --

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  BLAIS: With reference to the other matter, your Honor, we submit it.

THE COURT: All right. It appears to me that the defendant correctly is in Criminal History Category III at a level 31. So the guideline range is 135 to 168 months' imprisonment.

I'll now give defense counsel an opportunity to speak.

MR. MAZZUCCO: Thank you very much, your Honor.

Mr. Galanis, as I said earlier, fully accepts responsibility for what he has done. He will explain to the Court later, when he has an opportunity to speak, as I do ask the Court's permission for Ms. Monet Berger, Mr. Galanis's wife of ten years, also wants an opportunity to speak to the Court.

THE COURT: I'm happy to receive and I have, in fact, received a letter from Ms. Berger, but that is not my practice. So Ms. Berger's thoughts on the subject have been received and reviewed. I will give the defendant an opportunity to speak, but not other family members.

MR. MAZZUCCO: Thank you, your Honor.

So why is Mr. Galanis entitled to a variance in this case? In addition to the documents and pleadings that we've submitted, it was a very vigorously-litigated case, we'd like to just turn to one of the mirror image cases, that is the case of Mr. Jim Tagliaferri, who went to trial for many of the same transactions that are in this indictment. It's almost a mirror image indictment, although Mr. Tagliaferri had some additional charges that were brought with reference to IEAH and the racehorses.

Now, Mr. Tagliaferri was given a sentence of 72 months. I do agree with the government that he's much older than Mr. Galanis, but he did get a 72-month sentence after going to trial.

THE COURT: He was a leader. He got a leader and

1 organizer enhancement. 2 MR. MAZZUCCO: That is correct. 3 THE COURT: All right. 4 For which conduct? Because as I read the facts here, 5 this scheme goes back 2009 to 2011. Mr. Jason Galanis was in 6 it from the beginning. However, Tagliaferri does not come on 7 board until September 2010. He was a leader and organizer of the Gerova conspiracy, is that -- Tagliaferri was a leader and 8 9 organizer of the Gerova conspiracy? 10 MR. MAZZUCCO: Mr. Tagliaferri came on board in 2006, 11 when that all started with fund.com and made its way to Gerova. 12 So he was a leader; he was an organizer; he's a registered 13 investment advisor. 14 THE COURT: Well, the grand jury did not charge that there was a conspiracy in existence in 2006; is that correct? 15 MR. MAZZUCCO: That's correct. 16 17 I can't say what the government provided to the grand jury; I don't know what information -- there may have been some 18 19 statute of limitations issues with what they presented to the 20 government. 21 THE COURT: But you're asking me to consider that 22 Mr. Tagliaferri was a member of a criminal conspiracy in 2006. 23 Was he charged with being a member of a criminal

MR. MAZZUCCO: He was not.

24

25

conspiracy in 2006?

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Go ahead. 1 2 MR. MAZZUCCO: So he had a 72-month sentence. 3 The total value involved with Mr. Tagliaferri was \$51 million with reference to the embezzlement IEAH. 4 5 separate. But he did participate with Mr. Galanis. If you 6 look at the Tagliaferri indictment, Mr. Galanis is referred to 7 as associate, Associate 1's brother, who's an attorney. He's essentially an unindicted co-conspirator and what facts the 8 9 government chose to indict upon. 10 So I just give that to the Court as a point of 11 reference. He was given a 72-month sentence. 12 Also with reference to Mr. Galanis's father, John 13 Galanis, who will be before this Court tomorrow for sentencing, 14 Mr. Galanis was given a guideline range -- despite an extremely high criminal history -- of 97 to 121 months for his 15 disposition, his sentence. That's something the Court sort of 16 17 needs to take into consideration. Other factors that need to be taken into consideration 18 19

Other factors that need to be taken into consideration is that this was a conspiracy -- as this Court is well aware, you tried the *Gary Hirst* case. There were many people involved in these transactions.

THE COURT: And who is the prime mover?

MR. MAZZUCCO: John Galanis.

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Do you have any evidence to back that up?

MR. MAZZUCCO: Well, your Honor, I think the Court is

well aware in the sentencing of Jared Galanis, who pled to a misprision of felony, Mr. Galanis's younger brother, who's an attorney, that it was discovered after the government's indictment that the phone calls to Mr. Tagliaferri, the phone calls to Mr. Hamels were done by John Galanis --

THE COURT: Absolutely correct. And that was done late in the game after the principal fraud was accomplished. That was getting rid of the shares in the three Shahini accounts. That was late in the game, sir. That was not the origins of this conspiracy.

MR. MAZZUCCO: Your Honor, Mr. Galanis has been involved in the origins of this conspiracy for a long time from the very beginning, back to the days when he was in custody and he was having his son run The Money Store out of his dorm room at the University of California.

THE COURT: Anything before me of an evidentiary nature that supports the statements you're making now?

MR. MAZZUCCO: Your Honor, may my partner,
Mr. McClellan, please stand up; he'll explain a little bit of
that to you. He's worked on that side.

THE COURT: Anything of an evidentiary nature before me is the question,  $\sin$ .

MR. McCLELLAN: Your Honor, I believe it is within the scope of the indictment and the materials before you that the damages that are now the subject of the restitution were

generated by the stock transactions performed pursuant to John Galanis's direction.

THE COURT: That's late in the game. The assertion that was just made related to the origins of the conspiracy to which Mr. Jason Galanis pled guilty occurred while John Galanis was in prison and Jason Galanis was running -- was called The Credit Store, The Money Store or one of them, from prison.

MR. McCLELLAN: I don't want to speak for

Mr. Mazzucco, but I believe he's alluding to the fact that

Mr. John Galanis has been intruding on Jason Galanis's attempts

at business ventures since he was a very young man; he has

never left him to his own affairs and has continually distorted

those efforts.

In this case --

THE COURT: How did his father intrude on the Penthouse matter in which Judge Sweet of this Court entered a five-year SEC ban in 2007 from serving as an officer or director of Penthouse and imposed a \$60,000 penalty? My recollection is that Mr. Galanis got involved with the Penthouse transaction considerably earlier in time. I think it goes back to 2002.

MR. McCLELLAN: Mr. Galanis, through associations, introduced Jason Galanis to those principals.

THE COURT: And told them to commit securities fraud?

MR. McCLELLAN: Your Honor, I don't want to divert too

far from the scope of what we're talking about here, which is a sentence for this case and this conspiracy.

This conspiracy, we will submit, began when the formation of Gerova occurred. Mr. Tagliaferri was on the advisory board at the formation of Gerova. John Galanis was present and intervened to take control of the warrants at issue. Those warrants have been issued.

THE COURT: Where's the evidence of that, that John Galanis intervened to take control of the warrants at issue? I think that's what you just said. Where's the evidence of that?

MR. McCLELLAN: The presentence report, that once the warrants were obtained and they were in the Shahini account --

THE COURT: Oh, once they were in the Shahini account. But the backdating of the documents in the spring of 2010 had nothing to do with John Galanis or James Tagliaferri, as far as the information before me indicates.

MR. McCLELLAN: I agree.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. McCLELLAN: The sales and the transactions which occurred with regard to the financial advisors, the damages, that people injured, the victims, all that conduct occurred as a result of the transactions that were supervised solely by John Galanis and conducted at John Galanis's direction, without the prior knowledge of Jason Galanis.

Jason Galanis acknowledges that he became aware of

them and that he was complicit in the scheme as alleged. That's why he pled guilty. But he did not direct the sales; he did not make the arrangements and the matched trading that's been alleged here. For that reason — that's all I want to say. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. MAZZUCCO: Thank you, your Honor.

Another conversation I'd like to have with the Court is Mr. Galanis, since he's been remanded into custody, has had an incredible record next-door in the MCC. He's teaching a class. You saw that he received a work performance inmate evaluation and it's incredible. Eight out of the nine categories are outstanding. He'll explain to you why he has taken to teaching that class and what a different person he is.

THE COURT: He's an extremely bright and talented individual. I don't think there's any dispute from any quarter on that subject.

MR. MAZZUCCO: His work with Operation Gratitude, serving the troops of our country, Mr. Galanis is a good person. These are the characteristics of the defendant I would like the Court to consider at sentencing, even though he does accept full responsibility for what he did wrong. But he's gone in there; he's contrite; he's changed. The question is how long do we put Mr. Galanis in prison and what interest does that serve to have him serve an extremely long sentence, like

the sentence he followed his father through for many years, visited his father behind barbed wires in many different federal prisons, being introduced to people by his father who are of a different character in the business world.

We need to stop this cycle.

Mr. Galanis is not the person that he's portrayed in this indictment. He made these mistakes. But there's another side of him worth saving, another side of him worth giving another opportunity to.

So without anything further, I'd like to have this opportunity for Mr. Galanis to address the Court.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Galanis, this is your opportunity to speak, to bring to the Court's attention any facts or circumstances that you believe I should take account of. If there's anything you wish to say, Mr. Galanis, this is the time to say it.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, is it appropriate -- may I sit or shall I stand?

THE COURT: You may sit.

THE DEFENDANT: All right.

Your Honor, given how tense I am, I have written some notes and I hope you'll permit me to read from them.

THE COURT: That's perfectly fine.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you for the opportunity to address the Court.

I stand humbly before the Court in judgment. My hope is to relay in my own words how profoundly sorry I am for my conduct, and even more sorry for the adversity that has been imposed on others as a consequence of my conduct.

I'm both self-aware and smart enough to appreciate the damage that I've done, your Honor. Despite my awareness, there is something in my decision-making process that's deeply flawed, I acknowledge that. It's something I must use in the next years of incarceration to address, to identify, to try to correct.

After gaining my sea legs at MCC, which took me several months, your Honor — if you remember that was last May 2016 — I asked myself a number of questions. The two that are most pertinent, I think, for your Honor, in being reflective and thinking about my behavior, my aberrant behavior, was am I a bad person and do I just not recognize that.

I've asked myself also am I such a selfish person that I put my own needs before other people? And I've asked myself that time and again, looking at what are clearly criminal actions. And I ask them in the context — those questions I ask myself in the context of hundreds of compliant transactions, thousands or hundreds of thousands of moral interactions with people over my both career and my personal life. And I have to say, I have a long history of self-sacrifice for my family and for my friends. I don't think

I'm a selfish person. I've had a long history of business opportunities where I've behaved morally, your Honor. I've had opportunities where a criminal mindset would have compelled the theft of tens of millions of dollars; specific businesses, your Honor, where there was an opportunity; many opportunities to conduct criminal conduct and snatch money, and I did not. I resisted, your Honor. So I've tried to be reflective, your Honor, and tried to determine what it is that caused me to err in judgment and err so badly I breached into criminality and criminal conduct.

I guess the question that I've asked myself, your

Honor -- and thank you for giving me this time -- am I a bad

person or am I a good person that went bad. And it's possible.

Maybe I was good and I went bad. Clearly, bad acts suggest a

bad person. And there is some element, given my bad acts, that

I must have a bad element of me.

My own feeling though, your Honor, I'm a good person.

And I want you to know I believe I have a moral compass; I

believe I'm aware of my behavior; I believe that my moral

compass is not broken though, your Honor. I believe I have

ignored it, and I've ignored it willfully at times. And I have

to spend a number of years in prison rehabilitating myself in

trying to understand why it is I ignore, when I know full well

what's proper and improper, I know full well what's risky or

safe, your Honor, I know what's prudent or ill-advised. And,

your Honor, most of all, I know it was within the law and what was criminal. I am aware of it. You've pointed out I'm a smart man, I was aware of it, and there's no sugarcoating that, your Honor.

Over thousands of financings and 27 years of business, I was able to obey my moral compass, and I know right from wrong. And the certain occasions I just ignored it and I transgressed.

I have to say, your Honor, it wasn't until being thrown into MCC -- and I think the word is right, thrown into an environment I had never seen before. But I think your Honor was correct to -- and I think I wrote this to your Honor. You were correct to remand me, your Honor, to snap the behavior, snap me back into reality, to stop this cycle of justification and rationalization that people like me sometimes fall into, trying to defend my actions and using my intellect to continue to defend my past actions. I had to be forced into it.

And I will tell you that MCC is a sobering experience, your Honor. Your Honor knows the conditions, but I want to tell you my experience. Virtually all 95 of my fellow inmates in Five North, where I live and have lived for the last nine months, are street dealers in crack cocaine and heroin. And without any exaggeration, your Honor, they are universally accustomed to violence. It's evidenced by bullet wounds, knife scars on the vast majority of the people I live with.

I've witnessed firsthand now, your Honor, in the last nine months vicious fights, half of them with weapons, some were just jump-ins, they call them, where it's three-on-one gang beatings. Every week, your Honor, there's a rapid response team that storms my unit and forces us on the ground on our face for one violent act or another, one outburst or another.

But I have to say, your Honor, even in the middle of all of that, I'm not sure there was another way to scare me back into some sort of reflection, instead of the cycle of justification, which I had been in and I'm capable of. And without being shocked like that, I don't know that I wouldn't have continued, your Honor. And I think that also applies to my incarceration. Whatever time your Honor sees fit to impose on me, I think it's time that was required to snap my behavior.

Your Honor, I want you to also know a couple of things. I'll try not to impose too much on the Court's time, but I want you to know that I understand my old life is over; that I have no delusions that personally or professionally of going back to any business life. That's in the rearview mirror in every respect. I think I wrote your Honor, I said if -- I talked about a scarlet letter; I felt that way my whole life. But what I have to say to your Honor is if a scarlet letter is what I inherited in my family name, it's me alone that allowed that scarlet letter to metastasize into something much worse,

and that much worse was criminal conduct. It's one thing to have a bad reputation, it's a whole another thing to break the law, and especially knowingly breaking law. And then breaking law having the skills I have and still breaking the law, it's not excusable, your Honor, and I can't blame anybody except for myself.

To say though, your Honor, just to emphasize that I understand that my business life is over, however long I'm incarcerated, a phrase that myself and my colleagues used to use in the banking business was "that guy is radioactive." And what that meant was, Don't touch that guy.

I'm now that guy, your Honor. I'm that guy that nobody will ever touch again. So my life has forever changed, the course of my life. In a certain way, I'm thankful for it. I think I can apply myself, and my skills are translatable into other areas, your Honor. I think I've shown myself willing to do other things other than business. I don't view myself only as a businessman; my self-worth is not only as a businessman.

But, your Honor, whatever my future is, the inescapable torment will be the pain I've caused to others. There's no remedy for this other than my own suffering in being incarcerated. My wife has lost her husband, her home, any sense of normalcy. My little brother has lost his ability to practice law and make a living from his educational sacrifices. And other than short sellers, investors within Gerova lost all

their hard-earned money. My decisions contributed directly to an outcome that's unforgivable.

Your Honor, sometimes businesses fail and America gives us — the law gives us a second chance to rebuild to try again and again. And I believe that's fundamentally American. However, the same rule of law that fosters a special environment, commands obedience to a set of rules and fair play.

My conduct in 2010 betrayed the opportunity afforded me by our special American system. I breached that ability to try again, to overcome sins of my father. I breached that and I alone breached that, your Honor. I had my proverbial chance at bat and I struck out.

I won't strike out in life, your Honor. As I said, I have translatable skills. I'll use them in prison and I'll use them after I'm imprisoned. There will be a day when I'm out, your Honor; hopefully, sooner rather than later, but there will be a day, however long it is. I'm willing to face it. And I have skills that can be used and put to work. My life will be simpler, it will be smaller, your Honor; I hope it will be more rich, your Honor.

Your Honor, it's been seven years since the Gerova crimes. And the SEC and S.D.N.Y. doggedly pursued me the entire time, so I've lived with this for a long time now. I've lived nine months in the torments of prison, the trivial

torments and terrible torments. They've shaped me.

I want you to know, your Honor, that it's had an effect on me. Coming business sense will have an effect on me and I'll embrace it, your Honor. I want to earn the right to go home, your Honor. Through the passage of time, I'll earn it; through repentance, I'll earn it; and through my contributions to the world, I'll earn it.

Your Honor, business doesn't define me, you need to know that. Even though I spent my entire career trying to achieve in business, and "in business" means in pursuit of money, accumulation of money, that part of me is over; it's not necessary for me to be defined by it. And I want my good acts to define me, your Honor.

I do want to leave one quote that I've thought about every day, your Honor, and I hope it's appropriate. But while incarcerated, your Honor, I'll always be reminded about what Mohammad Ali had said. He said, "Don't count the days; make the days count." And I intend to make my days count, your Honor. All of this won't be for naught and I will make amends.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Galanis.

This is the government's opportunity to speak.

MR. BLAIS: Thank you, your Honor.

I first just wanted to clarify a couple of factual issues. There was some, I think, effort to compare the case here to Mr. Tagliaferri, and I think there was some reference

to Mr. Tagliaferri being a leader or organizer. Just for clarity of the record, Mr. Tagliaferri did not have any leadership points assessed at his sentencing; he was not a leader or organizer, at least for sentencing purposes under the guidelines. So I wanted to make sure that that was clear.

Also I wanted to, for your Honor's benefit,

Mr. Tagliaferri was certainly charged with various flavors of
criminal conduct. The Gerova conduct was not part of what

Mr. Tagliaferri was charged with. So he was not charged with
the matched trading activity that formed part of the case and
part of the trial here. So that was not part of his
indictment. There were certainly other crimes that he was
charged with, but that was not one of them. So I wanted to
just make that clear.

As we point out in our papers, sentencing is an individualized exercise. There obviously are various attributes that differentiate Mr. Tagliaferri on a personal level, but also from underlying conduct. I think, as we say in our papers, while it is true that Mr. Galanis was not the person directly interacting with Tagliaferri's clients, it was deals that Mr. Galanis organized, structured, and founded that were ultimately the garbage that Tagliaferri was placing with his clients. So absent Mr. Galanis, those transactions that defrauded and caused Tagliaferri's clients to lose millions of dollars, they don't happen without Mr. Galanis.

Now, there's also been some effort to highlight the role of John Galanis. And as I think we say in our papers, we don't dispute that John Galanis had an important role in this offense. He was the person who largely managed the placement of the Shahini shares in the various accounts; and there certainly was evidence at trial from Mr. Hamels and others that it was John, posing as his son, who coordinated some of that matched trading activity.

But John's involvement in those offenses doesn't in any way minimize Jason's role in this offense. There are obviously a number of areas where Jason was involved, one in the original issuance of the five million shares to Shahini in the first place. That wasn't Gary Hirst's idea on his own to issue these shares to Shahini. It wouldn't have made sense for Hirst to do it. He didn't get very much money from those shares; it was the Galanis family that got the money that was generated from the sale of the Shahini shares.

So, one, Jason was involved in that early stage in actually getting those shares issued in the first place.

Now, two, with respect to the matched trading, although, yes, it is true that it appears to have been John that was largely coordinating the actual day-to-day selling, it was Jason who reached the original deal with the Martin Kelly principals of Gavin Hamels, who testified at the trial, there was a meeting at the W Hotel in Los Angeles on June 23rd, 2010,

where the deal was structured. John Galanis wasn't at that meeting, it was Jason Galanis meeting with Gavin Hamels, meeting with Gavin Hamels' partner, Billy Crafton. Matt Jennings was the one who brought them all together, because the original problem for Martin Kelly was because they had invested in some of Mr. Jennings' entities that ultimately turned out to be a Ponzi scheme. So the solution was you, Martin Kelly, buy Gerova shares; and I, Jason Galanis, will give you free shares in the two entities I control, Rineon and WLMG Holding.

THE COURT: Buy one, get one free.

MR. BLAIS: Basically.

THE COURT: I think that was said.

MR. BLAIS: Yes.

So that matched trading activity that John Galanis then coordinated, never happens unless the deal is reached in the first place with Jason Galanis. And so it was Jason that set the deal in place that caused that to happen. And in support of that, we included as part of our sentencing submission an email that corroborates exactly what it was that Mr. Hamels said on the stand, which is an email from Galanis saying, Send the wire to Gavin; I reached a deal with him today, or something to that — in sum and substance, that's what that email says. It was Jason that reached that deal.

The third thing I would point to regarding Jason's role is follow the money; look at where the money ended up.

The single largest recipient of the proceeds of the Shahini sales was an entity called Basileus Holdings. We have the tax returns for that entity. It's 100 percent owned by Jason Galanis. Other entities, and we detail them in our submission as well, 1920 Bell Air LLC, a limited liability company that existed for the purpose of paying expenses associated with Jason Galanis's mansion in Bell Air.

The Galanis family trust, an entity that, from what we can tell from following the proceeds, largely existed to pay the credit card bills of various members of the Galanis family. That's where the money from the Shahini shares went to; it went to members of the Galanis family and largely to Jason Galanis and entities associated with Jason Galanis. So even if he wasn't actually the one generating all of the proceeds by calling Gavin Hamels and saying, Buy 20,000 shares of Gerova at \$6, he got a bunch of money, in fact, a significant portion, the most significant portion of the money that was generated from the Shahini sales. So, yes, John Galanis had an important role, but Jason Galanis did as well. And I certainly don't want his involvement, his role, in this scheme to be minimized.

Now, I listened to Jason Galanis's words, and I have no reason to doubt that they are sincere. But as your Honor knows, human beings are complex people. It is the rare defendant who comes before this Court or that we encounter who is entirely bad, completely irredeemable. Human beings have

good attributes and bad attributes and can participate in bad conduct even though they have good sides to them.

Let's not lose sight, let's be clear, the bad here was pretty bad. There were real people who lost a lot of money. Your Honor heard from some of them during the *Hirst* trial. You've heard from the children of Eleanor Kram and Rita Cole, who were clients of James Tagliaferri, who lost millions of dollars in Gerova; lost millions of dollars in fund.com.

Why? So that money could go to 1920 Bell Air LLC to pay for the landscaping at Jason Galanis's mansion in Bell Air. That's serious conduct that has serious consequences to real victims, to real people who lost money. This wasn't insider trading where there is a generalized market loss; this was real people who lost real money. And I think we've outlined some of the numbers in our submission. Tagliaferri's clients alone lost \$18 million on Gerova. They lost another 18 million or so on fund.com. I think together the losses, as we detail in the papers, \$44 million between fund.com, which, again, was part of the Count Eight plea here, and the Gerova conduct. So these are substantial losses suffered by real people. That's serious conduct that requires just punishment.

I think Mr. Galanis asked during his statement to you, in examining his conduct and in examining his conscience, was I a selfish person. And I think it's hard to look at these facts and not conclude that he was.

As I said, we've talked about the real people who've lost money. And, again, where did that money go? It went to Mr. Galanis's mansion in Bell Air; his apartment here, his \$10 million apartment here in New York; his Bentley that he drove around LA. I mean this was greed, pure and simple, money that was used to line his pocket so that he could live the high life. And that's, I think, what the evidence in this case shows. And again, I think that warrants a substantial sentence.

Let me just talk for one minute about the plea in the other cases.

There's been some argument about the criminal history score being manufactured by the government. Let's be clear. As in any plea offer, there was a plea offer made in the other matter, there were benefits to the defendant for that plea offer, there were benefits to the government in resolving that case. And it was Mr. Galanis's choice to either accept that plea offer or reject it with whatever consequences came from it.

And one of those consequences was ultimately bumping up the criminal history score in this case. That offer had an expiration date, as we said, and the parameters of that plea agreement, I think, as we indicated in our negotiations, would change if it wasn't accepted by that date. So there certainly were consequences, but there were benefits to Mr. Galanis from

that plea offer, as well, as in any plea offer. So I think the idea that that somehow was manufactured by the government, without there being any benefit to Mr. Galanis or that he was somehow forced to accept it, is just completely false and not borne out by the record.

And although it is true he is not being sentenced here for the conduct in that case, it's certainly relevant on the issue of individual and specific deterrence whether that's necessary. We are not looking at Mr. Galanis's crimes here in Gerova in isolation. He's a recidivist. He's admitted that he's a recidivist. He's engaged in multiple frauds, not just the Gerova fraud and the Tagliaferri fraud, but now a new fraud, a \$60 million fraud involving a Native American tribal entity that issued \$60 million of bonds that were placed in the accounts of unsuspecting investment advisory clients, including pension funds.

The Michelin pension fund, for example, is a victim of that offense and is now holding millions of dollars of tribal bonds for which there's no ready secondary market for which they can't monetize in the market. Again, an offense with real victims where the bonds were placed with real entities, with real pension beneficiaries who are now holding what are essentially worthless bonds.

This is a case that calls out for specific deterrence. There is a need to incapacitate Mr. Galanis from committing

further offenses, and that is yet another reason why I think a substantial sentence and one within the guidelines range is called for in this case.

So unless the Court has any further questions, we'll rest on our fairly detailed submission in this matter.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: This is the Court's statement of reasons for the sentence to be imposed on Jason Galanis:

In sentencing Mr. Galanis, I've considered all the materials that I've referenced at the outset. I've considered the statements of counsel, Mr. Mazzucco and Mr. McClellan, as well as what I consider to be the very sincere and thoughtful statement of Jason Galanis. I've also considered the very thoughtful statements of Mr. Blais. I've considered each of the factors set forth in Section 3553(a). I need not recount all that I've considered, but I've considered all of it.

The oath I took as a judge was to administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the rich and to the poor. And that is the obligation I face.

Jason Galanis is something of an enigma. If you saw him shortly before his arrest in this case, you would have seen someone who was the owner of a Bentley, which was later sold for \$115,000, had \$75,000 worth of watches, a beautiful \$7 million home in Bell Air, California, \$12 million co-op in lower Manhattan, and was riding high on top of the world. You

would have seen that in the 45 years leading up to his arrest, he had what -- to use an understatement -- was a most unusual background.

He was born into the world, grew up in Greenwich,

Connecticut, a family of privilege. Though it doesn't factor

into any of his arguments here, at the age of three his father

was sentenced on a conspiracy to make false statements to the

SEC and mail fraud and served about six months. That was a

sentence by Judge Brieant of this Court, my friend and late

colleague.

He lived in Greenwich until 1986, and then moved to the San Diego area. He reports that on the day he was to take his SAT exam, his father was arrested for conspiracy to defraud the IRS, tax fraud, securities fraud, bank fraud, and bribery. He says he went ahead and took the SAT. His father was sentenced to 324 months in prison by Judge Brieant on that second case.

As a college freshman, he started a company called Gulf Stream Financial, which acquired loans in default. And by 1996, the company had morphed into something called The Credit Store, which he seems to have been a 50 percent owner of. That was sold for 154 million. I have no idea how much Mr. Galanis truly netted from that, but I have no reason at this point to think that it was anything other than honest efforts on his part.

He left college in 1992 and remained in the San Diego area. By everything I can see, he had concern for his family and his brothers and was a great support to the family while his father was incarcerated.

In 1997/'98, he moved to London for 18 months. He started a company called Incubator Capital, which, in the .com era, opened and closed by 2000. He started a company called Extran, but as a result of legislation following the September 11 attacks, that business did not succeed.

In 2002, at the age of 32, he invested in General Media, the parent of Westinghouse, and ultimately, as a result of his involvement with the Penthouse investment, he was charged in an SEC enforcement action with preparing and filing a false 10-Q and received a five-year SEC ban from serving as a director and officer of a public company, and a \$60,000 civil penalty was imposed.

In '06, he married Monet Berger, and there were other ups and downs.

In 2001, his brother Derek was sentenced to federal imprisonment on an ecstasy conspiracy charge, unlawful distribution. It was with this backdrop that he began his involvement with something called Asia Special Situation Acquisition Corp., which was the subject of an IPO in 2008.

Jason Galanis was paid \$600,000 for his work in connection with that.

July 2008, his father is released from prison. By

January 2010, Asia Special Situation Acquisition Corp. faced a

deadline to make an acquisition. Among other things, it

acquired something called Wimbledon from Weston, and changed

its name to Gerova. Mr. Galanis could not become an officer of

Gerova; he became CEO of Gerova Advisors, LLC, a subsidiary.

He saw an opportunity and he launched a criminal scheme.

His brother Derek, who had lived in eastern Europe, recruited a Bosnian citizen, Shahini, to become the strawman who would acquire shares of Gerova. The reason the foreign national was important was the foreign national could hold unregistered shares or restricted shares without a restricted legend. I guess it would be unregistered shares on the theory that they are not going to be traded within U.S. markets.

Now, how is Shahini going to get any shares? Well, this was a two-step process: First, there was a January 22nd, 2010 agreement signed with Shahini. It was backdated. It was actually signed in May of 2010, but it was backdated to January 22nd. It provided for Shahini to receive a two percent commission for having brought about the acquisition of Wimbledon. That would be about \$2.2 million. Well, to state the obvious, Shahini had no involvement whatsoever with regard to Gerova's acquisition of Wimbledon. None. This was a total fraud.

The second step of this was to backdate from May of

2010 to March 29th of 2010 an agreement signed by Gary Hirst giving Shahini 11 million worth of warrants that purportedly was equal to the 2.2 million. And it was a right to purchase the 11 million shares at \$7.50, and it had a cashless exercise provision. The whole idea was, by May, they knew what the value of the shares were worth; they were worth \$13.56. So if you backdated it to January — not January, March 29, when it appeared they were only worth \$7.50, then it equated out to the \$2.28 million finder's fee, which itself was a fraud.

So in May of 2010, Shahini exercises 10 million worth of warrants and receives 5,333,333 shares of Gerova. That number is significant, because that happened to be the exact number of restricted shares that were returned by a CEO who separated from the company in April. And at \$13.56, the 5,333,333 shares were worth \$72 million. It was necessary to work with a lawyer and with Gary Hirst to get a representation that the shares could be -- from a lawyer that the shares could be transferred, because Shahini was a foreign national who represented that the shares would not be sold in U.S. markets. They were, in fact, sold in U.S. markets.

While all this was going on, also in May of 2010,

Jason Galanis was arrested in the Central District of

California for an attempt to evade or defeat income tax,

failure to report income relating to the sale of Penthouse

shares, failure to file income tax returns from 2003 to 2007, a

period in which he had six million in income, and, as a result of all this, he owed back taxes of \$1.9 million. Thereafter, the price of the Gerova shares started to decline and this presented a problem, because in order to realize dollars from the Gerova shares that were given to Shahini, they had to be sold. So Jason orchestrated a scheme in which others would get their clients to purchase the soon-to-be-worthless Gerova shares and then have coordinated sales of the Shahini sales to ultimately these individuals who were buying the stock that were soon going to decline in value.

By February 2011, the price had declined from a high of \$28.75, to \$5.28. They ultimately were worth zero. There's a stipulation here that the amount of loss was between 25 and \$65 million. It appears that there were approximately 60 victims of the scheme. Parenthetically, in March of 2011, Jason Galanis was sentenced to five years' probation on the Central District of California case.

Jason Galanis used his very considerable intellect and talents as a weapon. The reality here is he had the ability with those talents to live a good and successful life, enjoying many of the pleasures of life that are far beyond the reach of others. In other words, he didn't have to do it. When you take into account his own statement today, which I tend to credit — that his moral compass was not broken, it was ignored — that is something to be contemplated here. Because

what it means is there's a choice that's made to proceed. It's not someone who, as a result of tragedies in their life experiences, maybe addiction, maybe mental illness, has to use Mr. Galanis's very appropriate term, has a moral compass that is skewed or not functioning right.

This is a man who knew the consequences of his acts, and either for the thrill of the game, for being on top of the world in terms of the trappings of wealth, or for his own self-esteem as feelings of accomplishment, proceeded with this course of action. In that sense, Jason Galanis stands apart from many of the defendants who I see in this Court, including white-collar criminals.

I think that there is a need for just punishment in this case and there's a need for general deterrence.

As to specific deterrence, there is something to be said for Mr. Galanis's point that he is radioactive, though I have to quickly add that others who have been radioactive have found ways to continue a life of criminal behavior.

I'm mindful that Jason Galanis has another day of court ahead of him on other charges for which he has not yet been sentenced. I also accept at face value that Mr. Galanis has, in recent months, made a commitment to turn his life around. I choose to believe it. But it truly does not wipe away what has occurred here.

I've considered the sentencing guidelines, policy

Sentencing Commission. I've considered them in an advisory manner and recognize I'm not obligated to sentence within the guidelines. I've considered all of the matters that were set forth in the submissions under seal by the defendant and by the government, and taken full account of them as well. I acknowledge I have variance discretion.

Based upon all the surrounding circumstances, I intend to sentence Jason Galanis to a term of 135 months' imprisonment, three years' supervised release, and impose forfeiture of \$37,591,681.10, a special assessment of \$400, and restitution to be determined in further proceedings.

In view of the forfeiture and restitution obligations that Mr. Galanis has, I do not intend to impose a fine in this case.

Does the defendant or his counsel have any objection to the Court's proposed sentence or the statement of reasons for that sentence?

MR. MAZZUCCO: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Same question for the government.

MR. BLAIS: Just one request for an addition. I know that your Honor orally imposed the forfeiture order, but --

THE COURT: I will be doing it. I haven't done it yet.

MR. BLAIS: Oh, okay.

We just request when you impose the order at a future point, if you can also specifically order the forfeiture of Mr. Galanis's interests in the two properties that are specified on page 26 of our submission.

THE COURT: All right. And there is no written order on that.

MR. BLAIS: I believe there is. I think your Honor has already entered it.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MR. BLAIS: But, nonetheless, I think there needs to be an oral pronouncement of that forfeiture.

THE COURT: All right.

The defendant will please stand and I will impose sentence.

Jason Galanis, it is the judgment of this Court that you are hereby remanded to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons, to be imprisoned for 135 months on Count Two. You are also sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 60 months on Counts One, Five, and Eight, the sentence on Counts One, Five, and Eight to run concurrently with the sentence on Count Two, meaning a total sentence of 135 months' imprisonment.

Following your release, you shall be placed on supervised release with the following terms and conditions:

You shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime or

illegally possess a controlled substance nor possess a firearm or destructive device. The mandatory drug testing condition is suspended based on the Court's determination that you pose a low risk of future substance abuse. You shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by probation.

The standard conditions of supervision 1 through 13 are imposed, with the following special conditions: You shall report to the nearest probation office within 72 hours of release from custody. You may be supervised in the district of your residence. You shall provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information. You shall not incur new credit card charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer, unless you're in compliance with the installment payment schedule.

You shall submit your person, residence, place of business, vehicle, and any other property, computer, electronic communications, data storage devices, and/or other media under your control to a search on the basis that the probation officer has reasonable suspicion that contraband or evidence of a violation of the conditions of release may be found. The search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation. You shall inform any other residents that the premises may be subject to search pursuant to this condition.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It is further ordered that you shall pay to the United States a special assessment of \$400, which shall be due immediately.

Within 90 days, an order will be entered by this Court on restitution. And that order should contain a proposed payment schedule which takes account of the statutory factors in that regard.

The defendant shall forfeit his interest in the following property to the United States: A sum of money equal to \$37,591,681.10, including in that all right, title, and interest to a parcel of real property and the proceeds from the sale of same at 1920 Bell Air Road in Los Angeles, California. And further, all right, title, and interest in a cooperative apartment at 260 West Broadway, New York, New York, Unit 1, or the proceeds of any sale thereof.

Mr. Galanis, you have the right to appeal the sentence I have imposed on you. If you cannot afford the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal as a poor person. The time limits for filing a notice of appeal are brief and they are strictly enforced. If you request, the Clerk of Court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf immediately.

Do you understand all that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Is there anything further from the government? 1 MR. BLAIS: Yes. 2 3 At this time, your Honor, the government would move to 4 dismiss any open counts. 5 THE COURT: Without objection, that is granted. 6 Anything further from the defendant? 7 MR. MAZZUCCO: Yes, your Honor. With reference to --8 9 THE COURT: You may be seated, Mr. Galanis. 10 MR. MAZZUCCO: -- where Mr. Galanis is eventually 11 housed, we'd ask that the Court ask the Department of Corrections for Mr. Galanis to be housed somewhere near his 12 13 family in California. 14 THE COURT: The Court will recommend that the Bureau of Prisons house Mr. Galanis as close as feasible to Los 15 Angeles to facilitate family visits. 16 17 MR. MAZZUCCO: Thank you very much, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: All right. 19 With regard to the schedule on restitution, what are 20 you proposing? 21 MR. BLAIS: Your Honor, we propose we can submit 22 something within 30 days. 23 THE COURT: All right. So let's pick a date for that. 24 Or just, for simplicity's sake, if we want MR. BLAIS: 25 to do four weeks from today.

THE COURT: Let me pick an actual date so we know where we are.

Your submission will be due on Wednesday, March 15th; and any response from the defendant will be due March 31st; and any reply from the government, April 7th.

There is a hope that you will meet and confer in an effort to resolve the restitution issues.

MR. BLAIS: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Galanis, I take you at your word that you want to do something meaningful with your time. I suspect that you have the ability to figure something out that will be meaningful. I wish you the best in those efforts.

We are adjourned.

\* \* \*